

**PATENT APPLICATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**Applicant:** Contopanagos

**Serial No:** 10/074,293

**Filing Date:** 2/12/02

**Confirmation No.** 4912

**Title:** ON-CHIP INDUCTOR HAVING IMPROVED QUALITY FACTOR AND  
METHOD OF MANUFACTURE THEREOF

**Examiner:** Andujar

**Art Group:** 2826

**Docket No:** BP2108

---

Date: 12/4/07

Mail Stop:  
Commissioner for Patents,  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313

**Revival of Unintentionally Abandoned Patent Application  
Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b)**

The applicant respectfully requests that the above referenced patent application be revived, which unintentionally went abandoned. In support of this request, the applicant states the following.

1. On January 13, 2005, the applicant filed a petition to withdraw a notice of abandonment. A decision to dismiss the petition was issued on November 6, 2007. The petition stated the following:

a. In an Office Action dated August 13, 2002 regarding the above referenced patent application, a Restriction Requirement was imposed against the following claim groups:

- I. Claims 1-15, drawn to an on-chip inductor, classified in class 257, subclass 531; and
- II. Claims 16-30, drawn to a method for manufacturing an on-chip inductor, classified in class 438, subclass 15+.

In an appropriate response to the Office Action filed on 10/2/03, the Applicants provisionally elect Group I with traverse.

b. In an Office Action mailed on 12/31/03, the Examiner stated that the response filed on 10/2/03 was not fully responsive for failing to elect a species to be examined. The Examiner further stated that the method claims have already been withdrawn from consideration, however, a second restriction requirement was sent in regard to the several species that are being claimed.

c. In the office action mailed on 6/27/03 ("the second restriction requirement"), the Examiner stated that this application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species I: Figures 1A – 1B;  
Species II: Figures 2A – 2B;  
Species III: Figures 3A – 3B;  
Species IV: Figures 4A – 4B;  
Species V: Figure 5;  
Species VI: Figures 6A – 6B;  
Species VII: Figures 7A – 7B; and  
Species VIII: Figures 8A – 8B.

d. In a response to the 12/31/03 Office Action mailed on 3/3/04, the applicant argued, among other things that, based on the groupings provided by the Examiner, an election could not be made since the groupings are based on the figures and not on the claims.

e. In an Office Action mailed 4/9/04, the Examiner deemed the applicant's response as being non-responsive and provided a listing of species relating to the claims. The list is as follows:

Species I: Figures 1A – 1B, which correspond to claims 1 and 6;  
Species II: Figures 2A – 2B, which correspond to claim 2;  
Species III: Figures 3A – 3B, which correspond to claims 1, 2, 6, 9 and 10;  
Species IV: Figures 4A – 4B, which correspond to claims 1 – 3, 5, 6, 9, and 10;  
Species V: Figure 5, which correspond to claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11;  
Species VI: Figures 6A – 6B, which correspond to claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 12;  
Species VII: Figures 7A – 7B, which correspond to claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11; and  
Species VIII: Figures 8A – 8B, which correspond to claim 13;

The Examiner further stated that claims 14 and 15 appear not to read on any of the Species.

f. On, or about, 6/28/04, the applicant filed a response to the 4/9/04 office action, in which the applicant disagrees with the Species grouping of the Examiner and with the statement that claims 14 and 15 appear not to read on any of the Species.

g. On 11/18/04, a Notice of Abandonment was mailed for this patent application without a response to the 6/28/04 filing of the applicant.

2. The applicant is submitting herewith a response to the 4/9/04 office action, which provided the above mentioned election requirement of paragraph (e).

3. The applicant is submitting herewith the fee of \$1540 as required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17(m).

4. The applicant states that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional.

5. Based on the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the above referenced patent application be revived.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: /Timothy W. Markison reg. 33,534/  
Timothy W. Markison  
Phone: (808) 665-1725  
Fax No. (808) 665-1728

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Alexandria, Virginia 22313, on the date below:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature